REMARKS

Responsive to the lack of unity determination imposed in the outstanding Official Action of January 19, 2005, applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-8, with traverse.

Applicants believe that the Official Action fails to satisfy the requirements of PCT Rule 13.1 and 13.2. In particular, applicants believe that the Official Action does not show that the alleged groups of the present invention lack a special technical feature.

FIANI et al. relate to mechanisms for regulating (synthesis and degradation) the mannose receptor. The mannose receptor binds glycoproteins and is thought to be involved in antigen uptake and processing by macrophages and dendritic cells. The document by FIANI et al. analyzes the mannose receptor activity of clones of the mouse macrophage cell lines J774 along with the synthesis and degradation of the mannose receptor. The experiments in the document demonstrate that the clones have different abilities to bind ligand (mannose-BSA) and to internalize the ligand.

Thus, the document mainly suggests that "there may be two levels of regulation, one where receptor numbers are modulated by receptor synthesis and receptor degradation and a second where the intracellular itinerary of the receptor is modulated".

As a result, FIANI et al. merely disclose macrophage cells which have taken up and processed antigens via interaction between glycoproteins and glycoprotein-binding receptors. FIANI et al. do not disclose nor suggest the molecular complex of claims 1-8, nor monocyte-derived cells of claims 9-11 having internalized the molecular complex, nor an *ex vivo* or *in vivo* method for stimulating a cellular and/or humoral immune response by using the molecular complex. Indeed, it is believed that the monocyte-derived cells of the invention are distinct from the cells of FIANI et al. because the former have internalized and processed components of a tissue extract not disclosed by FIANI et al.

Nevertheless, should the Examiner maintain the restriction requirement, applicants respectfully maintain that Group IV, namely claims 13-14 should be examined with Group I since the methods of Group IV relate to the application of the molecular complex of Group I. In particular, FIANI et al. do not disclose nor suggest the molecular complex of Group I nor the *in vivo* method of Group IV consisting in inducing specific cellular and/or humoral immune responses against unknown components of tumor tissue extract.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding lack of unity determination is improper and must be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Philip Dubois, Reg. No. 50,696
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

PD/lrs